



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,396	04/30/2001	Wayne L. Randell	32423/82536	2724

7590 02/02/2007
Bobby B. Gillenwater, Esquire
BARNES & THORNBURG
600 One Summit Square
Fort Wayne, IN 46802

EXAMINER

LIVERSEGE, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3692

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,396

Applicant(s)

RANDELL ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer Liversedge

Art Unit

3692

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48 and 50-116 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48 and 50-116 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration of application 09/845,396 filed on January 18, 2007.

The amendment contains previously presented claims: 51-116.

The amendment contains amended claims: 48, 50.

Claims 1-47 were previously canceled and claim 49 is canceled in the current amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 48 and 50-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No. US 2003/0167229 A1 to Ludwig et al. (further referred to as Ludwig).

Regarding claims 48 and 50-71, Ludwig discloses a process for online invoice presentment and processing (pages 1-22), comprising:

Art Unit: 3692

a) generating at a biller entity an invoice for a service rendered to a customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 2, paragraphs 20-22; page 4, paragraph 32);

b) making information on the invoice electronically available to first and second users associated to the customer entity, the first user being associated with a first customer computer unit and the second user being associated with a second customer computing unit (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 1, paragraph 3; page 4, paragraph 32; page 7, paragraph 55-57; page 14, paragraph 96; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143);

c) transmitting over a communications network from the first customer computing unit to the biller entity a first data element indicating that the first user has approved the invoice (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 18, paragraph 122; page 21, paragraph 137; page 22, paragraph 143);

d) transmitting over the communications network from the second customer computing unit to the biller entity a second data element indicating that the second user has authorized payment of the invoice (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraph 139; page 22, paragraph 143).

Regarding claims 72-96, Ludwig discloses a process (pages 1-22) comprising:

a) and b) generating at a biller entity an invoice for a service rendered to a customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 2, paragraphs 20-22; page 4, paragraph 32);

c) making available to first and second users associated to the customer entity an electronic document providing information on the invoice (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 1, paragraph 3; page 4, paragraph 32; page 7, paragraph 55-57; page 14, paragraph 96; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143);

d) providing in the electronic document a user interface control, the user interface control providing a first input options to approve the invoice and a second input option to authorize payment of the invoice, the second input option being distinct from the first input option (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 18, paragraph 122; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 39; page 22, paragraph 143);

e) detecting granting of the payment of the invoice only when the first user has approved the invoice via the first input option and the second user has authorized payment of the invoice via the second input option (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraphs 96 and 97; page 18, paragraphs 122-123; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143).

Regarding claims 97-112, Ludwig discloses a process for granting payment of an invoice over a network, the invoice having been issued by a biller entity to a customer entity (pages 1-22), said process comprising:

Art Unit: 3692

a) accessing via a computer information on the invoice (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 2, paragraphs 20-22; page 4, paragraph 32);

b) transmitting from the customer entity to the biller entity a first data element indicating that the invoice has been approved by a first user associated with the customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 18, paragraph 122; page 21, paragraph 137; page 22, paragraph 143);

d) transmitting from the customer entity to the biller entity a second data element indicating that payment of the invoice has been authorized by a second user associated with the customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraph 139; page 22, paragraph 143).

Regarding claims 113-115, Ludwig discloses a method for electronically presenting and granting payment of invoices (pages 1-22), comprising:

a) generating at a biller entity an invoice for a service rendered to a customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 2, paragraphs 20-22; page 4, paragraph 32);

b) making information on the invoice electronically available to the customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 1, paragraph 3; page 4, paragraph 32; page 7, paragraph 55-57; page 14, paragraph 96; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143);

c) enabling at least two users associated to the customer entity to complete respective stages of a multi-stage invoice handling process (pages 1-22, specifically

Art Unit: 3692

such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 18, paragraph 122; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 39; page 22, paragraph 143);

d) transmitting over a communications network from each of said at least two users to the biller entity a respective data element indicating that the respective stage of the multi-stage invoice handling process has been completed (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraphs 96 and 97; page 18, paragraphs 122-123; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143).

Regarding claim 116, Ludwig discloses a process (pages 1-22), comprising:

a) generating by a biller entity an invoice for a service rendered to a customer entity (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 2, paragraphs 20-22; page 4, paragraph 32);

b) making available to first and second users associated to the customer entity an electronic document providing information on the invoice (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 1, paragraph 3; page 4, paragraph 32; page 7, paragraph 55-57; page 14, paragraph 96; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143);

c) providing in the electronic document a user interface control, the user interface control providing a first input option to approve the invoice and a second input option to authorize payment of the invoice, the second input option being distinct from the first input option (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraph 96; page 18, paragraph 122; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 39; page 22, paragraph 143);

d) notify the biller entity when the first and second input options have been selected to indicate that the first and second users have approved the invoice and authorized payment of the invoice, respectively (pages 1-22, specifically such as page 14, paragraphs 96 and 97; page 18, paragraphs 122-123; page 19, paragraph 124; page 21, paragraphs 137 and 139; page 22, paragraph 143).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 48 and 50-116 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 – 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached at 571-272-6777. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3692

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Liversedge

Examiner

Art Unit 3692



RICHARD E. CHILCOTE, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER